

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL)
THRASHER,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Case No. 2:19-cv-01007-AKK-JHE
THOMAS H. WOODFIN, et al.,)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

The magistrate judge filed a report on July 17, 2020, recommending the defendants' special report be treated as a motion for summary judgment. Doc. 22. The magistrate judge further recommended as follows:

- (1) the motion be granted as to all claims brought on behalf someone other than the plaintiff and that these claims be dismissed without prejudice;
- (2) the motion be granted as to defendants Adams and Gordy and to defendants Woodfin and Dunn to the extent they are sued in their individual capacities;
- (3) the motion be granted to the extent defendants Woodfin and Dunn are sued in their official capacities as to the plaintiff's First and Fourteenth Amendment claims; and
- (4) the motion be denied as to the plaintiff's Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act claims with referral of the latter back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings.

Id. Although the magistrate judge advised the parties of their right to file specific written objections within fourteen days, the court has not received any objections.

Having carefully reviewed and considered *de novo* all the materials in the court file, including the report and recommendation, the magistrate judge's report is hereby **ADOPTED** and the recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. Accordingly, the court **ORDERS** that the defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** as to all claims brought on behalf of someone other than the plaintiff and these claims are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

The court **FURTHER ORDERS** that the defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** as to defendants Adams and Gordy and to defendants Woodfin and Dunn to the extent they are sued in their individual capacities. The court **ORDERS** that the defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** to the extent defendants Woodfin and Dunn are sued in their official capacities as to the plaintiff's First and Fourteenth Amendment claims, and the motion is **DENIED** as to the plaintiff's RLUIPA claims. This matter is **REFERRED** to the magistrate judge for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

DONE the 14th day of August, 2020.



ABDUL K. KALLON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE